REMARKS

Claims 1-26, 28, 29 and 46-55 are pending in the present application.

Claim 26 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 27.

Claims 27, 30-45 and 56 are canceled.

Reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

The claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth herein. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Election/Restriction

The application was previously subjected to a restriction requirement. Claims 30-45 have been canceled in response thereto.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 26-29 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sutardja(US 2004/0223290).

Claim 26 has been amended and claim 56 canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 26 is amended to recite that the subunits are fused together with ceramic between the subunits. This distinguishes the claimed invention from a capacitor formed as a single unit as set forth in Sutardja. The rejection of claim 26 is therefore overcome by amendment.

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 26 and are therefore patentable for, at least, the same reasons as claim 26.

Claims 46-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vieweg et al. (US 2004/0125540).

Vieweg et al. is cited as teaching a capacitor comprising a pair of opposing faces and subunits wherein the subunits are parallel but within the same plane. The separate subunits terminate at separate external terminations thereby forming redundancy with two separate and distinct capacitive units in a common casing.

Claim 46 describes a capacitor comprising subunits arranged in parallel relationship. In deference to Vieweg et al. the first lead out tabs of the subunits terminate at a common first

external terminal and, likewise, the second lead out tabs of the subunits terminate at a common second external terminal. Vieweg et al. fails to recite common external termination of the subunits and therefore fails to anticipate claim 46.

Claims 46-55 depend from and further limit claim 46 and are therefore patentable for, at least, the same reasons as claim 46.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 46-55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vieweg et al. be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahiko et al. (USP 6,292,351) in view of Vinson et al. (US 6,700,794).

Ahiko et al. is cited as disclosing an electrical component comprising a capacitor mounted between a semiconductor and a microprocessor. In every instance Ahiko et al. describes a capacitive connection of the capacitor between the microprocessor and semiconductor. For example, in Figs. 7 and 8 one set of plates are in electrical contact with 107 and the

other set of plates are in electrical contact with 108 (or 109). There is no direct electrical connection between those components on either side of the capacitor. Furthermore, Ahiko et al. fails to describe a power tab on opposing faces of the capacitor or ground tabs on opposing sides of the capacitor. In fact, Ahiko et al. teaches against such a configuration since a direct short would be generated between the capacitive plate.

With the present invention power is passed directly through the capacitor and therefore both the power and ground tabs are in electrical contact with the components on either side thereof. In fact, the capacitor forms a direct electrical short between components. This is contrary to the teachings of Ahiko et al. which only has power tabs on one face and ground tabs on the opposite face.

Vinson et al. is cited as teaching high-speed digital integrated circuit microprocessors and memories. The Office opines that it would be obvious to combine the high-speed digital integrated circuit microprocessor of Vinson et al. in the system of Ahiko et al.

Assuming that one did combine Ahiko et al. and Vinson et al. one would still be led to form a capacitive connection

between opposing components based on the teachings of Vinson et al. There is no teaching in Vinson et al. which would augment that of Akiko et al. to such an extent necessary to contemplate a direct, or electrically shorted, connection across the capacitor. Therefore, the combination would still not lead one of skill in the art to the present invention or provide motivation for one of skill in the art to contemplate such a structure.

Claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the combination of Ahiko et al. and Vinson et al. due to the recitation of a structure which is contrary to the teachings of the combined art.

Regarding claim 2, Ahiko et al. fails to disclose a multiplicity of power tabs with at least one on each of two opposite faces as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, Ahiko et al. teaches against a power tab on the second face since this would short out the capacitor and render the capactive properties useless. Ahiko et al. specifically teaches against a power tab on the second face.

Regarding claim 4, Ahiko et al. does teach that the plates are substantially perpendicular to the board but they are

capacitively connected to the two components whereas the present invention is directly electrically connected.

Regarding claim 11, Ahiko et al. does disclose that the first coupling tab and power tab are opposing yet each face has only a power tab or a coupling tab not both.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahiko et al. in view of Vinson et al. is traversed. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahiko et al. in view of Vinson et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 2001-255954 (JP '954).

The combination of Ahiko et al. and Vinson et al. has been discussed previously and all comments applied relative to the rejection of claim 1 apply equally to the rejection of claim 10.

JP'954 is cited as teaching a solder strip. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 1. JP'954 fails to mitigate the deficiencies of the primary references. As set forth previously, the primary references would teach one of skill in

the art that the capacitor mounted between two components would be mounted in a capacitive connection. JP'954, as presented, does not provide any suggestion to one of skill in the art that the manner in which the capacitor can be mounted is anything different from that described by Ahoki et al. The inclusion of JP'954 is therefore of no consequence and the rejection is improper.

The rejection of claim 10 as being unpatentable over Ahiko et al. in view of Vinson et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 2001-255954 is traversed.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. in view of Nakaya et al. (US 4,982,485) and Vinson et al.

Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. have been discussed previously.

Nakaya et al. is cited as disclosing a printed circuit board as a substrate. Nakaya et al. fails to mitigate the deficiencies of the primary reference.

Nakaya et al. teaches a conventional capacitor structure wherein each adjacent plate terminates at opposing surfaces.

This teaching is no different from the capacitor described in Vieweg et al. and is therefore redundant. Nakaya et al. fails to provide any teaching upon which one of skill in the art would be inclined to ignore the teachings of Vieweg et al. with regards to the manner in which a capacitor is mounted between two components. One would still be inclined to mount the capacitor in a capacitive connection instead of a direct, or electrically shorted, connection.

The rejection of claims 1 and 12 are improperly based on art which fails to lead one of skill in the art to the claimed invention and which leads one away from the claimed invention. The rejection of claim 1 is traversed.

Claims 5-8 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are patentable for, at least, the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 13-17 ultimately depend from claim 12 and are patentable for, at least, the same reasons as claim 12.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 12-17 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Vieweg et al. in view of Nakaya et al. and Vinson et al. be withdrawn.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. in view of Vinson et al. Vinson et al. is not mentioned in the rejection and it is therefore assumed that the rejection was intended to be based on Nakaya et al.

Vieweg et al. is cited as disclosing an electrical component comprising power terminals and ground terminals. Reference is made to paragraph 28 wherein a capacitor (100) is shown mounted on a substrate. As set forth in paragraph 14 like numerals describe substantially similar components throughout the several views. Therefore, one can reasonably be expected to refer to Fig. 2 wherein the details of the capacitor are more clearly set forth. Capacitor (100) comprises power tabs on one side of the capacitor and ground tabs on the opposite side of the capacitor. One of skill in the art would have no basis for having both power and ground tabs on the same face as required in claim 18 of the present invention and therefore would have no ability to couple the capacitor to the chipboard as set forth in claim 18.

Nakaya et al. also teaches external termination of power on one face and ground on an opposite face. Therefore, the

teachings of Nakaya et al. do not extend or augment the teachings of Vieweg et al. and would not lead one of skill in the art to the electrical component of claim 18. The rejection of claim 18 is therefore improper and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-21 ultimately depend from claim 18 and are therefore patentable for, at least, the same reasons as claim 18.

The rejection of claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. in view of Vinson et al, or alternatively, Vieweg et al. in view of Nakaya et al. is traversed. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. as appled to claim 21 above, and further in view of JP 2001-255954 (JP'954).

Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. have been addressed previously and the arguments made previously are applicable here as well. In summary, Vieweg et al. fails to recite a capacitor

with power and ground termination on the same face and therefore fails to recite the electrical component of claim 21.

JP'954 is cited as teaching the use of a solder strip. JP'954 fails to lead one of skill in the art to a capacitor with power and ground termination on a common side and therefore fails to provide the teachings which are lacking in the primary references. The rejection of claim 22 is therefore improper and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. in view of Vinson et al. as applied to claim 21 and further in view of JP '954 is traversed. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al.

Vieweg et al. is cite as disclosing the invention except for the processor being a microprocessor. Applicants disagree for the reasons set forth previously herein. Vieweg et al. fails to recite a capacitor with power and ground termination on a common face and therefore also fails to recite the electronic component comprising same.

Vinson et al. is cited as disclosing a microprocessor. Vinson et al. fails to provide any disclosure which would lead one of skill in the art to a capacitor as set forth in claim 18 and in claims 23-24 by dependence on claim 18. The rejection of claims 23-24 is therefore improper and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. is traversed.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in veiw of Menzies et al. (USP 5,982,635).

Vieweg et al. and Vinson et al. have been discussed previously in response to the rejection of claim 18. The arguments made therein apply equally here.

Menzies et al. is cited as teaching a heat sink. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 depends from claim 18 and carries all limitations of claim 18. The additional

introduction of a heat sink therefore further limits the breadth of claim 18.

Menzies et al. fails to provide any teachings related to the capacitor of claim 18 or the manner in which it is mounted and therefore fails to mitigate the deficiencies of the art with which it is combined.

The rejection of claim 25 is improperly based on primary references which fail to obviate the claimed invention and the additional recitation of Menzies et al. which fails to provide those elements not taught in the primary references. The rejection is therefore overcome and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

All pending claims are in now believed to be in condition for allowance. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

May 5, 2005

Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration Number 35,172
Customer No.: 46591